

# **SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBIT**

## **Part 3**

**Order for Relief dated December 5, 2013 [Docket No. 1946]**

**Opinion Regarding Eligibility dated December 5, 2013 [Docket No. 1945]**

on the present case.”<sup>12</sup> In *Mahanna v. Bynum*, 465 B.R. 436 (W.D. Tex. 2011), the court held that *Stern* does not prohibit the bankruptcy court from dismissing the debtors’ chapter 11 case. The court concluded, “[T]his appeal is entirely frivolous, and constitutes an unjustifiable waste of judicial resources[.]” *Id.* at 442. In *In re Thalmann*, 469 B.R. 677, 680 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 2012), the court held that *Stern* does not prohibit a bankruptcy court from determining a motion to dismiss a case on the grounds of bad faith.<sup>13</sup> This line of cases strongly suggests that *Stern* likewise does not preclude a bankruptcy court from determining eligibility.

#### **E. The Objectors Overstate the Scope of *Stern*.**

Implicitly recognizing how far its objection to this Court’s authority stretches *Stern*, the objectors argue that two aspects of their objection alter the analysis of *Stern* and its application here. The first is that their objections raise important issues under both the United States Constitution and the Michigan Constitution. The second is that strong federalism considerations warrant resolution of its objection by an Article III court. Neither consideration, however, is sufficient to justify the expansion of *Stern* that the objectors argue.

##### **1. *Stern* Does Not Preclude This Court from Determining Constitutional Issues.**

First, since *Stern* was decided, non-Article III courts have considered constitutional issues, always without objection.

---

<sup>12</sup> See also *In re Gow Ming Chao*, 2011 WL 5855276 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. Nov. 21, 2011).

<sup>13</sup> See also *In re McMahan*, 2012 WL 5267017 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. Oct. 25, 2012); *In re Watts*, 2012 WL 3400820 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2012).

Both bankruptcy courts and bankruptcy appellate panels have done so.<sup>14</sup> More specifically, and perhaps more on point, in two recent chapter 9 cases, bankruptcy courts addressed constitutional issues without objection. *Association of Retired Employees v. City of Stockton, Cal.* (*In re City of Stockton, Cal.*), 478 B.R. 8 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2012) (holding that retirees' contracts could be impaired in the chapter 9 case without offending the constitution); *In re City of Harrisburg, PA*, 465 B.R. 744 (Bankr. M.D. Pa. 2011) (upholding the constitutionality of a Pennsylvania statute barring financially distressed third class cities from filing bankruptcy).

In addition, the Tax Court, a non-Article III court, has also examined constitutional issues, without objection.<sup>15</sup> Likewise, the Court of Federal Claims, also a non-Article III court,

---

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., *Williams v. Westby* (*In re Westby*), 486 B.R. 509 (10th Cir. BAP 2013) (upholding the constitutionality of the Kansas bankruptcy-only state law exemptions); *Res. Funding, Inc. v. Pacific Continental Bank* (*In re Washington Coast I, L.L.C.*), 485 B.R. 393 (9th Cir. BAP 2012) (upholding the constitutionality of the final order entered by the bankruptcy court); *Richardson v. Schafer* (*In re Schafer*), 455 B.R. 590 (6th Cir. BAP 2011), *rev'd on other grounds*, 689 F.3d 601 (6th Cir. 2012) (addressing the constitutionality of the Michigan bankruptcy-only state law exemptions); *Old Cutters, Inc. v. City of Hailey* (*In re Old Cutters, Inc.*), 488 B.R. 130 (Bankr. D. Idaho 2012) (invalidating a city's annexation fee and community housing requirements); *In re Washington Mut., Inc.*, 485 B.R. 510 (Bankr. D. Del. 2012) (holding Oregon's corporate excise tax unconstitutional under the Commerce Clause); *In re McFarland*, 481 B.R. 242 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2012) (upholding Georgia's bankruptcy-specific exemption scheme); *In re Fowler*, 493 B.R. 148 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2012) (upholding the constitutionality of California's statute fixing the interest rate on tax claims); *In re Meyer*, 467 B.R. 451 (Bankr. E.D. Wis. 2012) (upholding the constitutionality of 11 U.S.C. § 707(b)); *Zazzali v. Swenson* (*In re DBSI, Inc.*), 463 B.R. 709, 717 (Bankr. D. Del. 2012) (upholding the constitutionality of 11 U.S.C. § 106(a)); *Proudfoot Consulting Co. v. Gordon* (*In re Gordon*), 465 B.R. 683 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2012) (upholding the constitutionality of 11 U.S.C. § 706(a)); *South Bay Expressway, L.P. v. County of San Diego* (*In re South Bay Expressway, L.P.*), 455 B.R. 732 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 2011) (holding unconstitutional California's public property tax exemption for privately-owned leases of public transportation demonstration facilities).

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., *Field v. C.I.R.*, 2013 WL 1688028 (Tax Ct. 2013) (holding that the tax classification on the basis of marital status that was imposed by requirement that taxpayer file joint income-tax return in order to be eligible for tax credit for adoption expenses did not violate Equal Protection clause); *Begay v. C.I.R.*, 2013 WL 173362 (Tax Ct. 2013) (holding that the relationship classification for child tax credit did not violate Free Exercise Clause); *Byers v.*

*Footnote continued . . .*

has considered constitutional claims, without objection. This was done perhaps most famously in *Beer v. United States*, 111 Fed. Cl. 592 (Fed. Cl. 2013), which is a suit by Article III judges under the Compensation Clause of the United States Constitution.

*Stern* does not change this status quo, and nothing about the constitutional dimension of the objectors' eligibility objections warrants the expansion of *Stern* that they assert. As *Stern* itself reaffirmed, "We do not think the removal of counterclaims such as [the debtor's] from core bankruptcy jurisdiction meaningfully changes the division of labor in the current statute[.]"<sup>131</sup> S. Ct. at 2620. Expanding *Stern* to the point where it would prohibit bankruptcy courts from considering issues of state or federal constitutional law would certainly significantly change the division of labor between the bankruptcy courts and the district courts.<sup>16</sup>

---

C.I.R., 2012 WL 265883 (Tax Ct. 2012) (rejecting the taxpayer's challenge to the authority of an IRS office under the Appointments Clause).

<sup>16</sup> Only one case suggests otherwise. *Picard v. Flinn Invs., LLC*, 463 B.R. 280 (S.D.N.Y. 2011). That case did state in dicta in a footnote, "If mandatory withdrawal protects litigants' constitutional interest in having Article III courts interpret federal statutes that implicate the regulation of interstate commerce, then it should also protect, *a fortiori*, litigants' interest in having the Article III courts interpret the Constitution." *Id.* at 288 n.3.

This single sentence cannot be given much weight. First, it is only dicta. Second, it is against the manifest weight of the case authorities. Third, the quote assumes, without analysis, that the litigants do have an interest in having Article III courts interpret the Constitution, and thus bootstraps its own conclusion. Fourth, nothing in the *Flinn Investments* case states or even suggests that *Stern* itself prohibits a bankruptcy court from ruling on a constitutional issue where it otherwise has the authority to rule on the claim before it. Finally, the district court that issued *Flinn Investments* has now entered an amended standing order of reference in bankruptcy cases to provide that its bankruptcy court should first consider objections to its authority that parties raise under *Stern v. Marshall*. Apparently, that district court's position now is that *Stern* does not preclude the bankruptcy court from determining constitutional issues, including the constitutional issue of its own authority. The order is available at [http://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/rules/StandingOrder\\_OrderReference\\_12mc32.pdf](http://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/rules/StandingOrder_OrderReference_12mc32.pdf).

Two other cases are cited in support of the position that only an Article III court can determine a constitutional issue: *TTOD Liquidation, Inc. v. Lim (In re Dott Acquisition, LLC)*, 2012 WL 3257882 (E.D. Mich. July 25, 2012), and *Picard v. Schneiderman (In re Madoff Secs.)*, 492 B.R. 133 (S.D.N.Y. 2013). Both are irrelevant to the issue. *Dott Acquisition* did discuss

*Footnote continued...*

## **2. Federalism Issues Are Not Relevant to a *Stern* Analysis.**

The objectors' federalism argument is even more perplexing and troubling. Certainly the objectors are correct that a ruling on whether the City was properly authorized to file this bankruptcy case, as required for eligibility under 11 U.S.C. § 109(c)(2), will require the interpretation of state law, including the Michigan Constitution.

However, ruling on state law issues is required in addressing many issues in bankruptcy cases. As the Supreme Court has observed, “[B]ankruptcy courts [] consult state law in determining the validity of most claims.” *Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. of Am. v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.*, 549 U.S. 443, 444, 127 S. Ct. 1199, 1201 (2007). Concisely summarizing the reality of the bankruptcy process and the impact of *Stern* on it, the court in *In re Olde Prairie Block Owner, LLC*, 457 B.R. 692, 698 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2011), concluded:

[*Stern*] certainly did not hold that a Bankruptcy Judge cannot ever decide a state law issue. Indeed, a large portion of the work of a Bankruptcy Judge involves actions in which non-bankruptcy issues must be decided and that ‘stem from the bankruptcy itself or would necessarily be resolved in the claims allowance process,’ [131 S. Ct.] at 2618, for example, claims disputes, actions to bar dischargeability, motions for stay relief, and others. Those issues are likely within the ‘public rights’ exception as defined in *Stern*.

Other cases also illustrate the point.<sup>17</sup>

---

*Stern* but only in the unremarkable context of withdrawing the reference on a fraudulent transfer action. *Schneiderman* did not address a *Stern* issue at all, or even cite the case.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., *Picard v. Estate of Madoff*, 464 B.R. 578, 586 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (quoting *In re Salander O'Reilly Galleries*, 453 B.R. 106, 118 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2011)) (“It is clear” from *Stern v. Marshall* and other Supreme Court precedent that “the Bankruptcy Court is empowered to apply state law when doing so would finally resolve a claim.”); *Anderson v. Bleckner (In re Batt)*, 2012 WL 4324930, at \*2 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 20, 2012) (“*Stern* does not bar the exercise of the Bankruptcy Court’s jurisdiction in any and all circumstances where a party to an adversary

*Footnote continued . . .*

The distinction is clear. While in some narrow circumstances *Stern* prohibits a non-Article III court from adjudicating a state law claim for relief, a non-Article III court may consider and apply state law as necessary to resolve claims over which it does have authority under *Stern*. The mere fact that state law must be applied does not by itself mean that *Stern* prohibits a non-Article III court from determining the matter.

Moreover, nothing about a chapter 9 case suggests a different result. In *City of Cent. Falls, R.I.*, 468 B.R. at 52, the court stated, “Nor did [Stern] address concerns of federalism; although the counterclaim at issue in *Stern* arose under state law, the determinative feature of that counterclaim was that it did not arise under the Bankruptcy Code. The operative dichotomy was not federal versus state, but bankruptcy versus nonbankruptcy.”

The troubling aspect of the objectors’ federalism argument is that it does not attempt to define, even vaguely, what interest of federalism is at stake here.

In *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2500 (2012), the Supreme Court stated, “Federalism, central to the constitutional design, adopts the principle that both the National and State Governments have elements of sovereignty the other is bound to respect.” Accordingly, federalism is about the federal and state governments respecting each other’s sovereignty. It has nothing to do with the requirements of Article III or, to use the phraseology of *Stern*, with the “division of labor” between the district courts and the bankruptcy courts.<sup>18</sup> 131 S. Ct. at 2620. See also *City of Cent. Falls, R.I.*, 468 B.R. at 52, quoted above.

---

proceeding has not filed a proof of claim, or where the issue in an adversary proceeding is a matter of state law.”).

<sup>18</sup> Genuine federalism concerns are fully respected in bankruptcy through the process of permissive abstention under 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c)(1).

#### **F. Conclusion Regarding the *Stern* Issue**

For these reasons, the Court concludes that it does have the authority to determine the constitutionality of chapter 9 under the United States Constitution and the constitutionality of P.A. 436 under the Michigan Constitution.

#### **VIII. Chapter 9 Does Not Violate the United States Constitution.**

The objecting parties argue that chapter 9 of the bankruptcy code violates several provisions of the United States Constitution, both on its face and as applied in this case. The Court will first address the arguments that chapter 9 is facially unconstitutional under the Bankruptcy Clause of Article I, Section 8, and the Contracts Clause of Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution. The Court will then address the argument that chapter 9, on its face and as applied, violates the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the principles of federalism embodied therein.

##### **A. Chapter 9 Does Not Violate the Uniformity Requirement of the Bankruptcy Clause of the United States Constitution.**

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . establish . . . uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

The objecting parties, principally AFSCME, assert chapter 9 violates the uniformity requirement of the United States Constitution because chapter 9 "ced[es] to each state the ability to define its own qualifications for a municipality to declare bankruptcy, chapter 9 permits the promulgation of non-uniform bankruptcies within states." AFSCME's Corrected Objection to Eligibility, ¶ 58 at 25 (citing M.C.L. § 141.1558). (Dkt. #505) AFSCME argues that this is particularly so in Michigan, where P.A. 436 allows the governor to exercise discretion when

determining whether to authorize a municipality to seek chapter 9 relief, and also allows the governor to “attach whichever contingencies he wishes.” *Id.*

### **1. The Applicable Law**

The Supreme Court has addressed the uniformity requirement in several cases. In *Hanover Nat'l Bank v. Moyses*, 186 U.S. 181, 22 S.Ct. 857 (1902), the Court held that the incorporation into the bankruptcy law of state laws relating to exemptions did not violate the uniformity requirement of the United States Constitution. The Court stated, “The general operation of the law is uniform although it may result in certain particulars differently in different states.” *Id.* at 190.

In *Stellwagen v. Clum*, 245 U.S. 605, 38 S.Ct. 215 (1918), the Court upheld the Bankruptcy Act’s incorporation of varying state fraudulent conveyance statutes, despite the fact that the laws “may lead to different results in different states.” *Id.* at 613.

In *Blanchette v. Connecticut General Ins. Corps.*, 419 U.S. 102, 159, 95 S.Ct. 335 (1974), the Court held, “The uniformity provision does not deny Congress power to take into account differences that exist between different parts of the country, and to fashion legislation to resolve geographically isolated problems.”

The Supreme Court has struck down a bankruptcy statute as non-uniform only once. In *Railway Labor Executives' Ass'n v. Gibbons*, 455 U.S. 457, 102 S.Ct. 1169 (1982), the Court struck down a private bankruptcy law that affected only the employees of a single company. The Court concluded, “The uniformity requirement, however, prohibits Congress from enacting a bankruptcy law that, by definition, applies only to one regional debtor. To survive scrutiny under the Bankruptcy Clause, a law must at least apply uniformly to a defined class of debtors.”

*Id.* at 473.

More recently, the Sixth Circuit has addressed the uniformity requirement in two cases. In *Schultz v. United States*, 529 F.3d 343, 351 (6th Cir. 2008), the court concluded, “Over the last century, the Supreme Court has wrestled with the notion of geographic uniformity, ultimately concluding that it allows different effects in various states due to dissimilarities in state law, so long as the federal law applies uniformly among classes of debtors.” Summarizing the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Moyses*, *Stellwagen*, and *Blanchette*, the court stated, “Congress does not exceed its constitutional powers in enacting a bankruptcy law that permits variations based on state law or to solve geographically isolated problems.” *Id.* at 353.

In *Richardson v. Schafer (In re Schafer)*, 689 F.3d 601 (6th Cir. 2012), the court stated, “the Bankruptcy Clause shall act as ‘no limitation upon congress as to the classification of persons who are to be affected by such laws, provided only the laws shall have uniform operation throughout the United States.’” *Id.* at 611 (quoting *Leidigh Carriage Co. v. Stengel*, 95 F. 637, 646 (6th Cir. 1899)). It added, “*Schultz* clarified that it is not the *outcome* that determines the uniformity, but the uniform *process* by which creditors and debtors in a certain place are treated.” *Id.*

## 2. Discussion

Chapter 9 does exactly what these cases require to meet the uniformity requirement of the Bankruptcy Clause of the United States Constitution. The “defined class of debtors” to which chapter 9 applies is the class of entities that meet the eligibility requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 109(c). One such qualification is that the entity is “specifically authorized . . . to be a debtor under such chapter by State law, or by a governmental officer or organization empowered by State law to authorize such entity to be a debtor under such chapter[.]” § 109(c)(2). As *Moyses* and *Stellwagen* specifically held, it is of no consequence in the uniformity analysis that this

requirement of state authorization to file a chapter 9 case may lead to different results in different states.

It appears that AFSCME objects to the lack of uniformity that may arise from the differing circumstances of municipalities that the governor might authorize to file a chapter 9 petition. That is not the test. Rather, the test is whether chapter 9 applies uniformly to all chapter 9 debtors. It does.

Accordingly, the Court concludes that chapter 9 satisfies the uniformity requirement of the Bankruptcy Clause of the United States Constitution.

**B. Chapter 9 Does Not Violate the Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution.**

The Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution, which is Article I, Section 10, provides, "No State shall . . . pass any . . . Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, . . ." AFSCME argues that chapter 9 violates the Contracts Clause. This argument is frivolous. Chapter 9 is a federal law. Article I, Section 10 does not prohibit Congress from enacting a "Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts." *Id.*

As the court stated in *In re Sanitary & Imp. Dist.*, No. 7, 98 B.R. 970 (Bankr. D. Neb. 1989):

The Court further concludes that the Bankruptcy Code adopted pursuant to the United States Constitution Article 1, Section 8 permits the federal courts through confirmation of a Chapter 9 plan to impair contract rights of bondholders and that such impairment is not a violation by the state or the municipality of Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution which prohibits a state from impairing such contract rights.

*Id.* at 973.

Or, more succinctly stated, "The Bankruptcy Clause necessarily authorizes Congress to make laws that would impair contracts. It long has been understood that bankruptcy law entails

impairment of contracts.” *Stockton*, 478 B.R. at 15 (citing *Sturges v. Crowninshield*, 17 U.S. 122, 191 (1819)).

### **C. Chapter 9 Does Not Violate the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.**

The Tenth Amendment provides, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

This Amendment reflects the concept that the United States Constitution “created a Federal Government of limited powers.” *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 457, 111 S. Ct. 2395 (1991); *see also United States v. Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 124, 61 S. Ct. 451 (1941) (The Tenth Amendment “states but a truism that all is retained which has not been surrendered.”).

The Supreme Court’s “consistent understanding” of the Tenth Amendment has been that “[t]he States unquestionably do retain a significant measure of sovereign authority . . . to the extent that the Constitution has not divested them of their original powers and transferred those powers to the Federal Government.” *New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144, 156, 112 S. Ct. 2408 (1992) (quoting *Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority*, 469 U.S. 528, 549, 105 S.Ct. 1005 (1985) (quotation marks omitted); *see also South Carolina v. Baker*, 485 U.S. 505, 511 n.5, 108 S. Ct. 1355 (1988) (“We use ‘the Tenth Amendment’ to encompass any implied constitutional limitation on Congress’ authority to regulate state activities, whether grounded in the Tenth Amendment itself or in principles of federalism derived generally from the Constitution.”); *United States v. Sprague*, 282 U.S. 716, 733, 51 S. Ct. 220 (1931) (“The Tenth Amendment was intended to confirm the understanding of the people at the time the Constitution was adopted, that powers not granted to the United States were reserved to the states or to the people.”).

The objecting parties argue that chapter 9 violates these principles of federalism because, in the words of AFSCME, it “allows Congress to set the rules controlling State fiscal self-management—an area of exclusive state sovereignty.” AFSCME’s Corrected Objection to Eligibility, ¶ 40 at 15-16. (Dkt. #505) The Court interprets this argument as a facial challenge to the constitutionality of chapter 9. The as-applied challenge, as stated by the Retiree Committee and other objecting parties, is that *if* the State of Michigan can properly authorize the City of Detroit to file for chapter 9 relief without the explicit protection of accrued pension rights for individual retired city employees, then chapter 9 “must be found to be unconstitutional as permitting acts in derogation of Michigan’s sovereignty.” Retiree Committee Objection to Eligibility, ¶ 3 at 1-2. (Dkt. #805)

Before addressing the merits of these arguments, however, the Court must first address two preliminary issues that the United States raised in its “Memorandum in Support of Constitutionality of Chapter 9 of Title 11 of the United States Code” – standing and ripeness. (Dkt. #1149)

#### **1. The Tenth Amendment Challenges to Chapter 9 Are Ripe for Decision and the Objecting Parties Have Standing.**

The United States argues that the creditors who assert that chapter 9 violates the Tenth Amendment as applied in this case lack standing and that this challenge is not ripe for adjudication at this stage in the case.<sup>19</sup> The Court concludes that the objecting parties do have standing and that their challenge is now ripe for determination.

---

<sup>19</sup> The standing and ripeness issues are discussed here because the United States and the City framed this issue in the context of the Tenth Amendment challenge to chapter 9 of the

*Footnote continued...*

### a. Standing

“As a rule, a party must have a ‘personal stake in the outcome of the controversy’ to satisfy Article III.” *Stevenson v. J.C. Bradford & Co. (In re Cannon)*, 277 F.3d 838, 852 (6th Cir. 2002) (citing *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 498, 95 S. Ct. 2197 (1975), quoting *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 204, 82 S. Ct. 691, 703 (1962)).

In a bankruptcy case, the standing of a party requesting to be heard turns on whether the party is a “party in interest.” See *In re Global Indus. Techs., Inc.*, 645 F.3d 201, 210 (3rd Cir. 2011). A party in interest is one who “has a sufficient stake in the proceeding so as to require representation.” *In re Amatex Corp.*, 755 F.2d 1034, 1042 (3d Cir. 1985).

11 U.S.C. § 1109(b), provides, “A party in interest, including . . . a creditor . . . may raise and may appear and be heard on any issue in a case under this chapter.” 11 U.S.C. § 901(a) makes this provision applicable in a chapter 9 case.

In the chapter 9 case of *In re Barnwell County Hosp.*, 459 B.R. 903, 906 (Bankr. D.S.C. 2011), the court stated, “‘Party in interest’ is a term of art in bankruptcy. Although not defined in the Bankruptcy Code, it reflects the unique nature of a bankruptcy case, where the global financial circumstances of a debtor are resolved with respect to all of debtor’s creditors and other affected parties.”

In a chapter 9 case on point, *In re Suffolk Regional Off-Track Betting Corp.*, 462 B.R. 397, 403 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2011), the court held that a party to an executory contract with a municipal debtor has standing to object to the debtor’s eligibility.

---

bankruptcy code. To the extent that the argument might also be made to the other constitutional challenges to chapter 9, the same considerations would apply and would lead to the same conclusion.

Similarly, in *In re Wolf Creek Valley Metro. Dist. No. IV*, 138 B.R. 610 (D.Colo. 1992), also a chapter 9 case, the court stated, “[M]any courts have concluded that the party requesting standing must either be a creditor of a debtor . . . or be able to assert an equitable claim against the estate.” *Id.* at 616 (citation and quotation marks omitted). *See also In re Addison Community Hospital Authority*, 175 B.R. 646 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 1994) (holding that creditors are parties in interest and have standing to be heard).

Under 11 U.S.C. § 1109(b) and these cases, it is abundantly clear that the objecting parties, who are creditors with pension claims against the City, have standing to assert their constitutional claim as part of their challenge to this bankruptcy case.

Nevertheless, the United States asserts that *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 112 S.Ct. 2130 (1992), precludes standing here. In that case, the Supreme Court adopted this test to determine whether a party has standing under Article III of the constitution:

Over the years, our cases have established that the irreducible constitutional minimum of standing contains three elements. First, the plaintiff must have suffered an “injury in fact”—an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized and (b) “actual or imminent, not ‘conjectural’ or ‘hypothetical.’”. Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of—the injury has to be “fairly . . . trace[able] to the challenged action of the defendant, and not . . . th[e] result [of] the independent action of some third party not before the court.” Third, it must be “likely,” as opposed to merely “speculative,” that the injury will be “redressed by a favorable decision.”

*Id.* at 560-61 (internal citations omitted). The United States asserts that the objecting parties do not meet this standard because their injury is not “imminent” at this stage of the proceedings.

The Court concludes that the contours of standing under 11 U.S.C. § 1109(b) are entirely consistent with the constitutional test for standing that the Supreme Court adopted in *Lujan*. A creditor has a direct, personal stake in the outcome of a bankruptcy case and thus has standing to

challenge the bankruptcy filing. Accordingly, the Court concludes that every creditor of the City of Detroit has standing to object to its eligibility to be a debtor under chapter 9.

#### b. Ripeness

The United States argues that the issue of whether chapter 9 is constitutional as applied in this case is not ripe for determination at this time. The City joins in this argument. City's Reply to Retiree Committee's Objection to Eligibility at 3-5. (Dkt. #918)

The premise of the argument is that the filing of the case did not result in the impairment of any pension claims. Thus the United States argues that this issue will be ripe only when the City proposes a plan that would impair pensions if confirmed. Until then, it argues, their injury is speculative.<sup>20</sup>

In *Miles Christi Religious Order v. Township of Northville*, 629 F.3d 533 (6th Cir. 2010), the Sixth Circuit summarized the case law on the ripeness doctrine:

The ripeness doctrine encompasses “Article III limitations on judicial power” and “prudential reasons” that lead federal courts to “refus[e] to exercise jurisdiction” in certain cases. *Nat'l Park Hospitality Ass'n v. Dep't of Interior*, 538 U.S. 803, 808, 123 S. Ct. 2026, 155 L.Ed.2d 1017 (2003). The “judicial Power” extends only to “Cases” and “Controversies,” U.S. Const. art. III, § 2, not to “any legal question, wherever and however presented,” without regard to its present amenability to judicial resolution. *Warshak v. United States*, 532 F.3d 521, 525 (6th Cir. 2008) (en banc). And the federal courts will not “entangl[e]” themselves “in abstract disagreements” ungrounded in the here and now. *Abbott Labs. v. Gardner*, 387 U.S. 136, 148, 87 S. Ct. 1507, 18 L.Ed.2d 681 (1967); see *Warshak*, 532 F.3d at 525. Haste makes waste, and the “premature adjudication” of legal questions compels courts to resolve matters, even constitutional matters, that may with time be

---

<sup>20</sup> The United States agrees that the objecting parties' facial challenge to chapter 9 is appropriate for consideration at this time. Memorandum in Support of Constitutionality at 3. (Dkt. #1149)

satisfactorily resolved at the local level, *Nat'l Park Hospitality Ass'n*, 538 U.S. at 807, 123 S.Ct. 2026; *Grace Cnty. Church v. Lenox Twp.*, 544 F.3d 609, 617 (6th Cir. 2008), and that "may turn out differently in different settings," *Warshak*, 532 F.3d at 525.

To decide whether a dispute has ripened into an action amenable to and appropriate for judicial resolution, we ask two questions: (1) is the dispute "fit" for a court decision in the sense that it arises in "a concrete factual context" and involves "a dispute that is likely to come to pass"? and (2) what are the risks to the claimant if the federal courts stay their hand? *Warshak*, 532 F.3d at 525; *see Abbott Labs.*, 387 U.S. at 149, 87 S.Ct. 1507.

*Id.* at 537.

Although the argument of the United States has some appeal,<sup>21</sup> the Court must reject it, largely for the same reasons that it found that the objecting parties have standing. The ultimate issue before the Court at this time is whether the City is eligible to be a debtor in chapter 9. This dispute arises in the concrete factual context of the City of Detroit filing this bankruptcy case under chapter 9 of the bankruptcy code and the objecting parties challenging the constitutionality of that very law. This dispute is not an "abstract disagreement ungrounded in the here and now."

It is here and it is now.

The Court further concludes that as a matter of judicial prudence, resolving this issue now will likely expedite the resolution of this bankruptcy case. The Court notes that the parties have fully briefed and argued the merits. Further, if the Tenth Amendment challenge to chapter 9 is resolved now, the parties and the Court can then focus on whether the City's plan (to be filed shortly, it states) meets the confirmation requirements of the bankruptcy code.

---

<sup>21</sup> Early in the case, the Court expressed its doubts about the ripeness of this constitutional issue in the eligibility context. The Court was concerned that the issue of whether pension rights can be impaired in bankruptcy would be more appropriately considered a confirmation issue, as the United States argues now. At the request of the objecting parties, however, the Court reconsidered that position and now agrees that the issue is ripe at this point.

Accordingly, the Court concludes that the objecting parties' challenge to chapter 9 of the bankruptcy code as applied in this case is ripe for determination at this time.

## 2. The Supreme Court Has Already Determined That Chapter 9 Is Constitutional.

The question of whether a federal municipal bankruptcy act can be administered consistent with the principles of federalism reflected in the Tenth Amendment has already been decided. In *United States v. Bekins*, 304 U.S. 27, 58 S. Ct. 811 (1938), the United States Supreme Court specifically upheld the Municipal Corporation Bankruptcy Act, 50 Stat. 653 (1937), over objections that the statute violated the Tenth Amendment. *Bekins*, 304 U.S. at 53-54.

In upholding the 1937 Act, the *Bekins* court found:

The statute is carefully drawn so as not to impinge upon the sovereignty of the State. The State retains control of its fiscal affairs. The bankruptcy power is exercised in relation to a matter normally within its province and only in a case where the action of the taxing agency in carrying out a plan of composition approved by the bankruptcy court is authorized by state law. It is of the essence of sovereignty to be able to make contracts and give consents bearing upon the exertion of governmental power.... The reservation to the States by the Tenth Amendment protected, and did not destroy, their right to make contracts and give consents where that action would not contravene the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

*Bekins*, 304 U.S. at 51-2.

The Court further noted that two years earlier, it had struck down a previous version of the federal municipal bankruptcy law for violating the Tenth Amendment. *Ashton v. Cameron*

*County Water Improvement Dist. No. 1*, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S. Ct. 892 (1936).<sup>22</sup> The Court found, however, that in the 1937 Act, Congress had “carefully” amended the law “to afford no ground for [the Tenth Amendment] objection.” *Bekins*, 304 U.S. at 50. The Court quoted approvingly, and at length, from a House of Representatives Committee report on the 1937 Act:

---

<sup>22</sup> It is interesting that Justice Cardozo did not participate in the *Bekins* decision. 304 U.S. at 54. In his dissent in *Ashton* two years before, he made this astute observation about the economic realities of municipal bankruptcies:

If voluntary bankruptcies are anathema for governmental units, municipalities and creditors have been caught in a vise from which it is impossible to let them out. Experience makes it certain that generally there will be at least a small minority of creditors who will resist a composition, however fair and reasonable, if the law does not subject them to a pressure to obey the general will. This is the impasse from which the statute gives relief. . . . *To hold that this purpose must be thwarted by the courts because of a supposed affront to the dignity of a state, though the state disclaims the affront and is doing all it can to keep the law alive, is to make dignity a doubtful blessing.* Not by arguments so divorced from the realities of life has the bankruptcy power been brought to the present state of its development during the century and a half of our national existence.

298 U.S. at 541 (emphasis added). He then made this argument regarding the constitutional foundation for municipal bankruptcy law, which, arguably, the Court in *Bekins* adopted:

The act does not authorize the states to impair through their own laws the obligation of existing contracts. Any interference by the states is remote and indirect. At most what they do is to waive a personal privilege that they would be at liberty to claim. *If contracts are impaired, the tie is cut or loosened through the action of the court of bankruptcy approving a plan of composition under the authority of federal law. There, and not beyond in an ascending train of antecedents, is the cause of the impairment to which the law will have regard.* Impairment by the central government through laws concerning bankruptcies is not forbidden by the Constitution. Impairment is not forbidden unless effected by the states themselves. No change in obligation results from the filing of a petition by one seeking a discharge, whether a public or a private corporation invokes the jurisdiction. *The court, not the petitioner, is the efficient cause of the release.*

*Id.* at 541-42 (citations omitted) (emphasis added).

There is no hope for relief through statutes enacted by the States, because the Constitution forbids the passing of State laws impairing the obligations of existing contracts. Therefore, relief must come from Congress, if at all. The committee are not prepared to admit that the situation presents a legislative no-man's land. It is the opinion of the committee that the present bill removes the objections to the unconstitutional statute, and gives a forum to enable those distressed taxing agencies which desire to adjust their obligations and which are capable of reorganization, to meet their creditors under necessary judicial control and guidance and free from coercion, and to affect such adjustment on a plan determined to be mutually advantageous.

*Id.* at 51 (quotation marks omitted).

*Bekins* thus squarely rejects the challenges that the objecting parties assert to chapter 9 in this case and it has not been overruled.

It is well-settled that this Court is bound by the decisions of the Supreme Court. In *Agostini v. Felton*, 521 U.S. 203, 117 S. Ct. 1997 (1997), the Court stated, “[i]f a precedent of this Court has direct application in a case, yet appears to rest on reasons rejected in some other line of decisions, the Court of Appeals should follow the case which directly controls, leaving to this Court the prerogative of overruling its own decisions.” *Id.* at 237 (quoting *Rodriguez de Quijas v. Shearson/American Express, Inc.*, 490 U.S. 477, 484, 109 S. Ct. 1917 (1989) (quotation marks omitted)). See also *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 288 F.3d 732, 744 (6th Cir. 2002).

Nevertheless, the objecting parties assert that subsequent amendments to the municipal bankruptcy statute and subsequent Supreme Court decisions regarding the Tenth Amendment compel the conclusion that *Bekins* is no longer good law, or at least that it is inapplicable in this case. Specifically, in its objection, AFSCME argues that since *Bekins* was decided, “intervening Supreme Court precedent holds that states can fashion their own municipal reorganization statutes, but cannot consent to any derogation of their sovereign powers.” AFSCME’s

Corrected Objection to Eligibility, ¶ 44 at 17. (Dkt. #505) Although the Court concludes that *Bekins* remains good law and is controlling here, the Court will address these arguments.

### **3. Changes to Municipal Bankruptcy Law Since 1937 Do Not Undermine the Continuing Validity of *Bekins*.**

The only relevant change to municipal bankruptcy law that AFSCME identifies is the addition of § 903 to the bankruptcy code, the substance of which was added in 1946 as § 83(i) of the 1937 Act. That section provided, “[N]o State law prescribing a method of composition of indebtedness of such agencies shall be binding upon any creditor who does not consent to such composition, and no judgment shall be entered under such State law which would bind a creditor to such composition without his consent.”

In slightly different form, § 903 of the bankruptcy code now provides:

This chapter does not limit or impair the power of a State to control, by legislation or otherwise, a municipality or in such State in the exercise of the political or governmental powers of such municipality, including expenditures for such exercise, but—

(1) a State law prescribing a method of composition of indebtedness of such municipality may not bind any creditor that does not consent to such composition; and

(2) a judgment entered under such a law may not bind a creditor that does not consent to such composition.

11 U.S.C. § 903.

AFSCME argues that this provision created a new exclusivity in chapter 9 that forces the states to adopt the federal scheme for adjusting municipal debts. This exclusivity, the argument goes, deprives the states of the ability to enact state legislation providing for municipal debt adjustment, which is inconsistent with the principles of federalism set forth in *New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144, 112 S. Ct. 2408 (1992), and *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 117 S. Ct. 2365 (1997).

This argument fails on two levels. First, other than in one limited instance, *Faitoute Iron & Steel Co. v. City of Asbury Park, N.J.*, 316 U.S. 502, 62 S. Ct. 1129 (1942), courts have always interpreted the Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution to prohibit the states from enacting legislation providing for municipal bankruptcies. The 1946 amendment that added the provision that is now § 903 did not change this law.

Second, neither *New York* nor *Printz* undermine *Bekins*. As developed above, at its core, *Bekins* rests on state consent. As will be developed below, like *Bekins*, both *New York* and *Printz* are also built on the concept of state consent. Indeed, it was the lack of state consent to the federal programs in those cases that caused the Supreme Court to find them unconstitutional.

**a. The Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution  
Prohibits States from Enacting Municipal Bankruptcy Laws.**

The Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 10, states, “No State shall . . . pass any . . . Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts[.]”

Applying this clause, the Supreme Court has stated, “When a State itself enters into a contract, it cannot simply walk away from its financial obligations.” *Energy Reserves Grp., Inc. v. Kansas Power & Light Co.*, 459 U.S. 400, 412 n.14, 103 S. Ct. 697 (1983). “It long has been established that the Contracts Clause limits the power of the States to modify their own contracts as well as to regulate those between private parties.” *U.S. Trust Co. of New York v. New Jersey*, 431 U.S. 1, 17, 97 S. Ct. 1505 (1977) (citing *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 4 L. Ed. 629 (1819); *Fletcher v. Peck*, 3 L. Ed. 162 (1810)). Section 903 simply restates this principle.

Moreover, contrary to AFSCME’s assertion, it is clear that *Bekins* fully considered this issue. It found, “The natural and reasonable remedy through [bankruptcy] was not available under state law by reason of the restriction imposed by the Federal Constitution upon the impairment of contracts by state legislation.” *Bekins*, 304 U.S. at 54.

**b. Asbury Park Is Limited to Its Own Facts.**

As noted above, only one case, *Asbury Park*, is to the contrary. The Court concludes, however, that this case represents a very narrow departure from these principles and its holding is limited to the unique facts of that case. Indeed, the Court itself stated, “We do not go beyond the case before us.” 316 U.S. at 516.

The adjustment plan at issue in *Asbury Park* was “authorized” by the New Jersey state court on July 21, 1937. This was after the federal municipal bankruptcy law was struck down in *Ashton* and before the enactment of the municipal bankruptcy act that *Bekins* approved. Moreover, in *Asbury Park*, the bonds affected by the plan of adjustment, which the Court found were worthless prior to the adjustment, were reissued without a reduction in the principal obligation and became significantly more valuable as a result of the adjustment. *Asbury Park*, 316 U.S. at 507-08, 512-13.

The limited application of *Asbury Park* to its own facts has been repeatedly recognized. The cases now firmly establish that the Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution bars a state from enacting municipal bankruptcy legislation. In *U.S. Trust Co. of New York v. New Jersey*, 431 U.S. 1, 27, 97 S. Ct. 1505 (1977), the Supreme Court observed, “The only time in this century that alteration of a municipal bond contract has been sustained by this Court was in [Asbury Park].”<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Interestingly, in *U.S. Trust Co.*, the Court further observed that when a State seeks to impair its own contracts, “complete deference to a legislative assessment of [the] reasonableness and necessity [of the impairment] is not appropriate because the State’s self-interest is at stake.” *Id.* 431 U.S. at 26. For that reason, “a state is not completely free to consider impairing the obligations of its own contracts on a par with other policy alternatives.” *Id.* at 30-31. The Constitution astutely recognizes that a federal court brings no such self-interest to a municipal bankruptcy case.

In *In re Jefferson Cnty.*, Ala., 474 B.R. 228, 279 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. 2012), *aff'd sub nom. Mosley v. Jefferson Cnty. (In re Jefferson Cnty.)*, 2012 WL 3775758 (N.D. Ala. Aug. 28, 2012), the court stated, “A financially prostrate municipal government has one viable option to resolve debts in a non-consensual manner. It is a bankruptcy case. Outside of bankruptcy, non-consensual alteration of contracted debt is, at the very least, severely restricted, if not impossible.” The court added, “There has been only one instance in this and the last century when the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained the alteration of a municipal bond contract outside a bankruptcy case.” *Id.* at 279 n.21. It further observed that *Asbury Park* has since been “distinguished and its precedent status, if any, is dubious.” *Id.*

Accordingly, the Court concludes that the addition of § 903 to our municipal bankruptcy law does not undermine the continuing validity of *Bekins*.

**4. Changes to the Supreme Court’s Tenth Amendment Jurisprudence Do Not Undermine the Continuing Validity of *Bekins*.**

**a. *New York v. United States***

In *New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144, 112 S. Ct. 2408 (1992), the Supreme Court considered a Tenth Amendment objection to the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985, 42 U.S.C. § 2021b, *et seq.* Congress enacted that law to address the problem of identifying storage sites for low-level radioactive waste. 505 U.S. at 152-54. The Act provided three different incentives for each state to take responsibility over the nuclear waste generated within its borders. *Id.*

The first was a monetary incentive to share in the proceeds of a surcharge on radioactive waste received from other states, based on a series of milestones. 505 U.S. at 171. The Court found this program constitutional because it was, in fact, nothing more than an incentive to the

state to regulate. Congress had “placed conditions—the achievement of the milestones—on the receipt of federal funds.” *Id.* at 171. The states could choose to achieve these milestones, and receive the federal funds, or not. *Id.* at 173. “[T]he location of such choice in the States is an inherent element in any conditional exercise of Congress’ spending power.” *Id.*

The Court then stated, “In the second set of incentives, Congress has authorized States and regional compacts with disposal sites gradually to increase the cost of access to the sites, and then to deny access altogether, to radioactive waste generated in States that do not meet federal deadlines.” *Id.* The Court held that this provision was also constitutional, again because the states retained the choice to participate in the federal program or not.

The Court explained, “Where federal regulation of private activity is within the scope of the Commerce Clause, we have recognized the ability of Congress to offer States the *choice* of regulating that activity according to federal standards or having state law pre-empted by federal regulation.” *Id.* at 173-74 (emphasis added). “[T]he choice remains at all times with the residents of the State, not with Congress. The State need not expend any funds, or participate in any federal program, if local residents do not view such expenditures or participation as worthwhile.” *Id.* at 174.

These two provisions of the Act passed constitutional muster precisely because states could consent to participation in the federal program or withhold their consent as they saw fit.

The Court held that these two programs:

represent permissible conditional exercises of Congress’ authority under the Spending and Commerce Clauses respectively, in forms that have now grown commonplace. Under each, Congress offers the States a legitimate choice rather than issuing an unavoidable command. The States thereby retain the ability to set their legislative agendas; state government officials remain accountable to the local electorate.

*Id.* at 185.

In contrast, the third of these provisions - the “take title” provision” - forced the states to choose between either regulating the disposal of radioactive waste according to Congress’s standards or “taking title” to that waste, thereby assuming all the liabilities of its producers. *Id.* at 174-75. The Court held that this provision violated the Tenth Amendment, because it offered the states no choice but to do the bidding of the federal government. This provision, the Court determined, did not ask for state “consent” but instead “commandeered” the states.

The Court’s precedent is clear that the federal government may not require the states to regulate according to federal terms. “[T]he Constitution has never been understood to confer upon Congress the ability to require the States to govern according to Congress’ instructions.” *Id.* at 162. “Congress may not simply ‘commandeer[r] the legislative processes of the States by directly compelling them to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program.’” *Id.* at 161 (quoting *Hodel v. Virginia Surface Mining & Reclamation Assn., Inc.*, 452 U.S. 264, 288, 101 S. Ct. 2352 (1981)).

The “take title” provision did just that. Although guised as a “so-called incentive” scheme, the Court found that the “take title” provisions offered the states no real choice at all.

Because an instruction to state governments to take title to waste, standing alone, would be beyond the authority of Congress, and because a direct order to regulate, standing alone, would also be beyond the authority of Congress, it follows that Congress lacks the power to offer the States a choice between the two.

*Id.* at 176. The “take title” provisions did not give the states what the Court deemed the constitutionally “critical alternative[.]” *Id.* at 176. “A State may not decline to administer the federal program. No matter which path the State chooses, it must follow the direction of Congress.” *Id.* at 177.

The cornerstone of *United States v. New York*, then, is state consent. The federal government may constitutionally encourage, incentivize, or even entice, states to do the federal government's bidding. It may not command them to do so.

**b. *Printz v. United States***

The Supreme Court reiterated these principles in *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 117 S. Ct. 2365 (1997), and extended them to Congressional efforts to compel state officers to act. At issue in *Printz* were provisions of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, 18 U.S.C. § 922, that required state and local law enforcement officers to carry out background checks for firearms dealers in connection with proposed sales of firearms. It also required that the background checks be performed in accordance with the federal law. *Printz*, 521 U.S. at 903-04.

The Court concluded that while state and local governments remained free to voluntarily participate in the background check program, the “mandatory obligation imposed on [law enforcement officers] to perform background checks on prospective handgun purchasers plainly runs afoul [of the Constitution].” *Id.* at 933. Again, the stumbling block was a lack of state consent:

We held in *New York* that Congress cannot compel the States to enact or enforce a federal regulatory program. Today we hold that Congress cannot circumvent that prohibition by conscripting the State’s officers directly. The Federal Government may neither issue directives requiring the States to address particular problems, nor command the States’ officers, or those of their political subdivisions, to administer or enforce a federal regulatory program.

521 U.S. at 935.